

REMARKS

A Request for Continued Examination is being filed contemporaneously herewith. Applicants request reconsideration of the above-identified application. Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10, 11, 14, 28-30, 32-36, 38-41, 43-48, and 50-55 are pending in this application, with Claim 45 being withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 28, 32, 38, 47, 48, and 51-55 have been amended.

All of the pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In an Office Action mailed January 23, 2009, Claims 49 and 50 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Applicants submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 49 and 50 were indicated as allowable in an Office Action mailed January 23, 2009. Applicants thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter. Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include the limitations of allowable Claim 49 and intervening Claim 9. Applicants have also amended Claims 28, 32, 38, 47, and 48 to include what applicants believe to be the allowable subject matter.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10, 11, 14, 28-30, 32-36, 38, 43, 44, 46-48, and 50-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4834552, issued to Makowka (hereinafter "Makowka"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 3265287, issued to Hovland (hereinafter "Hovland"), and U.S. Patent No. 3659463, issued to Christiansen et al. (hereinafter "Christiansen"). In addition, Claim 41 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Makowka in

view of Hovland and U.S. Patent No. 3650463, issued to Christiansen, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4607749, issued to Jacob (hereinafter "Jacob").¹

As mentioned above, applicants have amended Claim 1 to include the limitations of allowable Claim 49 and intervening Claim 9, obviating the rejections. Applicants have also amended Claims 28, 32, 38, 47, and 48 to include what applicants believe to be allowable subject matter directed to "more than two" rows or lines of areas of reduced thickness, perforations, or score lines. The cited references, whether alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "more than two" rows or lines. Accordingly, applicants request withdrawal of the claim rejections.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain that may be expeditiously addressed in a telephone interview, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESSSMLLC



Emily C. Peyser
Registration No. 59,844
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1634

ECP:cj

¹ Applicants note that Claims 39 and 40 have not been specifically addressed in the Office Action.